

as our former Secretary of State Colin Powell, Attorney General Eric Holder, Assistant Secretary of the Interior-designee Wilma Lewis, and Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor. But there are many others.

We may look back as far as the period to 1900 to 1920, which marked the initiation of mass labor migration from the Caribbean to the United States and the formation of the first large Caribbean communities here in this country.

We should not forget World War I, when the recruitment of labor from the Caribbean became imperative. More than 100,000 Caribbean laborers were recruited for agricultural and tedious jobs as part of war labor. We should acknowledge the Caribbean men and women who served our country and those who continue to serve this country overseas in its conflicts today.

So I feel it has been an honor and privilege as a Caribbean American, whose roots lie in Cuba, Antigua, St. Kitts and the Danish Indies, now the Virgin Islands, to host this hour, where the Congressional Black Caucus has recognized and paid tribute to Caribbean American heritage.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today recognizing June as National Caribbean American Heritage month and to acknowledge the important contributions Caribbean-Americans have made to our Nation's history.

Let me begin by thanking Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the Virgin Islands for anchoring tonight's CBC hour honoring Caribbean American Heritage Month.

I want to also thank Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS for their tremendous leadership on Caribbean Issues.

I would like to acknowledge The Institute for Caribbean Studies and all the other Caribbean-American organizations that worked to make Caribbean-American Heritage Month a great success.

As a long time supporter of the Caribbean and a frequent visitor to the region, I was very proud to see us celebrate this important commemorative month for the third year. Since the resolution's initial passage by Congress in 2006, the President has issued a proclamation recognizing Caribbean-American Heritage Month in June 2006, 2007, and 2008.

People of Caribbean heritage reside in every part of our country. Since 1820, millions of people have emigrated from the Caribbean region to the United States.

Throughout U.S. history we have been fortunate to benefit from countless individuals of Caribbean descent, who have contributed to American government, politics, business, arts, education, and culture—including one of my personal heroes, the Honorable Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

Shirley Chisholm was a woman of Ba-jan and Guyanese descent, who never forgot her roots in the Caribbean. She was the first African American woman elected to Congress and the first woman to run for President.

My political involvement began as a volunteer during her historic presidential campaign in 1972. Through her mentorship, she

strengthened my interest in addressing issues of importance to the African Diaspora both here in the U.S. and abroad.

In addition to Shirley Chisholm, during Caribbean-American Heritage Month, we also recognize people like Alexander Hamilton, Hazel Scott, Sidney Poitier, Wyclef Jean, Eric Holder, Colin Powell, Harry Belafonte, Celia Cruz, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, and many others who helped shape this country.

Caribbean-American Heritage Month also provided an opportunity for us to strengthen our long-term partnership with CARICOM nations through greater dialogue and engagement. From disaster preparedness, education, and the campaign against HIV/AIDS and other health disparities, we share a number of mutual policy interests with our Caribbean neighbors.

For example, last year we were able to address these important issues regarding the Caribbean, through the Institute for Caribbean Studies' Caribbean-American Legislative Forum held on the Hill.

In addition, the Caribbean People International Collective Inc (CPIIC) held a roundtable discussion on health in the immigrant community. This event promoted the goals and ideals of National Caribbean-American HIV/AIDS Awareness Day (NCAHAAD).

Most recently, last year's global rise in food costs keenly affected the people of the Caribbean, particularly our friends in Haiti. The crisis highlighted the need for reengagement and opened the door for innovative policy solutions.

Last year, CARICOM Heads of State held their New York Conference on the Caribbean under the theme "A 20/20 Vision", where they met with regional policy makers, the academic community, private sectors and financial institutions, as well as members of the Caribbean Diaspora to better integrate policy interests between the U.S. and the Caribbean.

National Caribbean American Heritage month promotes the importance of recognizing that our policies in the Caribbean affect us in the United States. Caribbean-American Heritage Month reminded us of the large and diverse constituencies of Caribbean-Americans in our nation and provided an opportunity to send a message of good will to the Caribbean community both here and abroad.

Caribbean American Heritage Month also provided an opportunity to celebrate and share in the rich culture of our Caribbean neighbors, through showcases of Caribbean art, festivals, concerts, and film.

Just as we commemorate the achievements of the many diverse communities in our nation, the United States Government should encourage all people to celebrate the rich history and diversity of Caribbean Americans.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring the Caribbean-American community, and acknowledge their service to our society.

A LOT OF CZARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank you for rec-

ognizing me today. I have some stuff I think is kind of interesting to talk about.

Let's start with recently, while listening to the radio, I heard an announcement that President Obama was appointing a gentleman to be named the compensation czar, and that kind of threw me. Being an old criminal law trial judge, I remember the drug czars of the past. I remember I think a couple of Homeland Security czars. But I never had heard of a compensation czar.

So I started to look into it, and I always thought it was kind of peculiar for a democratic country to even use the term "czar." But others adopted it ahead of time, so I have no criticism of using the term "czar," though I think if you look up "czar" in the dictionary, you will find out the most popular version is a form of the Russian totally autocratic emperors of the old Imperial Russia. To me, I think it sounds a little funny for us to be comparing ourselves with that failed system. But, you know, I can't criticize it too much, because we have had multiple folks that have had the name "czar."

Exactly what are these czars that we create in this country? Well, the best I have been able to determine, these are people who are hired members of the executive branch of the government, but they are not like Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare or Secretary of Labor. But they are given sort of absolute authority in their field to give direction to the government and to advise the President as his personal kind of alter-Cabinet, if you will.

Now, the first thing that comes to mind when you wonder about that is, you say now, wait a minute, all these secretaries that become members of the Cabinet, they have to be confirmed by the Senate. Constitutionally, it is required that they be confirmed by the Senate.

We have these confirmation battles in every administration, and actually some issues have come up this time which caused people to withdraw their names before the issue of whether or not they be confirmed, for reasons like they didn't pay their taxes or some other reason that they felt they didn't want to go through that kind of an onerous process of getting to be the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce or whatever Secretary it may be, which for a long time has been the historical heads of departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government. But now we have these new guys that are going to be czars.

Now, it wasn't so hard to figure out when you said, well, you have got an Attorney General who is one of the Cabinet members, and he is confirmed by the Senate, just like the Constitution requires, and to have somebody who is totally focusing on the drug fight that we have. Maybe that might not be such a bad idea. So that is kind of the first concept of czar that I can

recall, and I think probably at some time Ronald Reagan may have used that term. So, you can understand that.

But when you hear “czar,” you think Russian. When you think of Russian czars, you think of the Romanov dynasty, which is the dynasty that was ultimately overthrown by the communist revolution. From its inception and for 300 years, the Romanov rule had 18 czars, and two or three of them didn’t last very long, and in 146 days the Obama administration has 22 czars.

Now, these folks have lots of titles, these 22 czars, but if “czar” means what czar has sort of historically meant, it is designed to give them sort of an absolute in-charge position on a certain subject matter. And, remember, these folks are not ones who would have to be confirmed, the way I understand it, in order to hold a position. These are just hired folks that the President, through his presumed authority, gives them this power to do this. So, the Russians took 300 years and we took 146 days to create this “czardom,” if you will.

Now, let’s see who these folks are. The best I can tell, this is a pretty accurate list of our czars that have been created by the Obama administration.

We start off with the border czar, Alan Bersin, and then the energy czar, Carol Browner. I believe she was part of the EPA last time, maybe under Carter or Clinton, I’m not sure. Probably Clinton. I don’t know all about all these people.

The urban czar is Adolfo Carrion. The infotech czar is Vivek Kundra. The faith-based czar is Joshua DuBois, at least it has been reported he is an atheist, but that is his faith, I suppose. Health reform czar, Nancy-Ann DeParle, I guess it is. TARP czar, we have all heard about the TARP, Herb Allison is the TARP czar. The stimulus accountability czar is Earl Devaney. The nonproliferation czar, Gary Samore. I may be mispronouncing these folks’ names. Let me say right off, if I mispronounce anybody’s name, it is because I am from Texas, and I just apologize for that.

The terrorist czar is John Brennan. The regulatory czar, there is an interesting one, Cass Sunstein. The drug czar, we have seen that one before. The drug czar is Gil Kerlikowske, it looks like. The Guantanamo closure czar, which is on the front page of all the papers, is Daniel Fried. The AF-PAK czar is Richard Holbrooke. The Mideast peace czar, George Mitchell. We are very familiar with him, former Senator Mitchell.

The Persian Gulf-Southwest Asia czar, Dennis Ross. The Sudan czar, J. Scott Gratton. The climate czar, Todd Stern. The car czar, Steve Rattner. He has been all over the place. The economic czar, Paul Volcker, who is very famous. The executive pay czar, that is one of my favorites right there. The executive pay czar is Kenneth Feinberg. And then the cybersecurity czar, posi-

tion to be announced, but they are going to have one.

Now, right off I wondered about the cybersecurity czar, because we have got an infotech czar up here, which is sort of both first cousins anyway, and I don’t know whether they will be working together or what, but they are going to have absolute power in their field, whatever that means. I think this is something we ought to be curious about. That is so many czars.

You know what is interesting? The Russians gave nicknames to some of their czars based on their behavior. I wonder who is going to adopt some of the nicknames for some of the czars? I don’t think anyone would like to be called Alan the Terrible. We had an Ivan the Terrible in the Russian Romanov dynasty. I am sure they would all like to be Peter the Great or Catherine the Great, have “the Great” after their name.

□ 2045

But I guess we can make up names for them. But the question is, why? I think it’s a question that the administration ought to have to answer.

You know, I’m not the only one asking these questions. A statement from Senator ROBERT BYRD said: “The rapid and easy accumulation of power by White House staff can threaten the constitutional system of checks and balances. At the worst, White House staff has taken direction and control of programmatic areas that are the statutory responsibility of Senate-confirmed officials.”

And he’s raising the same issue that I was raising just a few minutes ago, and that is, these people don’t go through the confirmation process. There’s no Senators looking and seeing what kind of reputation these people have, what they’ve done in the past, where their area of expertise is, whether or not this is the most qualified person, whether this is the person who would meet the constitutional requirements of serving our Nation. I know these are hired by the President. It’s like there’s this alternate universe that we’re creating. We’ve got the Cabinet. I guess you leave the Cabinet and you go over to the czardoms and you meet with them, or maybe they all get in one room and battle it out. I don’t know how it works. We’ll see.

But this is sizably more czars than we’ve ever had. In fact, taking a look at President Ronald Reagan, he had one czar. President George Herbert Walker Bush had one czar. President Bill Clinton had three czars. President George W. Bush had four czars. So we’ve gone 1, 1, 3, 4, 22.

If these czars are set up to target historically needed help for people in this country, I think it’s done with a good heart. But I really think we should be, we as the American people, should start asking why. Why should you hire somebody, for instance, to be the border czar? Now, Allan may be a really nice guy and he may be smart as a whip.

We also have Ms. Napolitano, who is the head of Homeland Security, and it is her statutory responsibility to be in charge of defending the borders of this country. And, in fact, it’s the constitutional responsibility of every Member of this House to defend our borders. But it’s certainly her statutory responsibility to defend our Nation.

We have an Energy Department; and the Secretary of Energy, I think, the best I can figure out, is supposed to be responsible for the Energy Department. Now, I wonder why we have to have this energy czar.

Urban czar. Well, we’ve got a Department of Urban Development that’s, you know, Housing and Urban Development, HUD. That’s been around for an awful long time. That is a Cabinet post. So why all of a sudden do we need an urban czar? We never had one before.

Infotech czar. I don’t know where that would fall in the purview of the established secretariats by the Constitution or by statute, but somewhere.

Faith-based czar, I can—we’ve dealt with the head of a faith-based initiative in the Bush White House that came under a lot of criticism from the now-majority; but they’ve created one, and at least it is reported, put an atheist in charge of that, which, seems to me seems rather strange.

The health reform czar should be active right now, because, as I understand it, the President spent his day today trying to convince people in various places that we needed this massive health reform that he’s seeking to put up. And he wants to actually create, put the government in competition with private industry on health care, I would say, leading to the kind of health care, ultimately, maybe through the back door, but ultimately, I think there’s no doubt, and most experts would say, the recommendations that they’re making, that they’re pushing forward between now and probably the 4th of July, are to set in motion the possibility of a single-pay health care system in the United States run by the government. And when we have that, we will see the quality of our health care plummet, and we will see people like me, people in Washington, making decisions as to what certain people are supposed to do for health care, and rationing that health care.

Now, if you ask our good friends and neighbors to the north in Canada, you say, we hear you’ve got the greatest health care system in the world. They said, it is good; it’s real good as long as you’re well. But if you get sick, you’ve got to get on a waiting list to get treated.

And, in fact, we have a greater cure rate for breast cancer in this country by about 30 points, percentage points, than they do in Canada because they wait too long to take action on the breast cancer issue. Same thing goes for prostate cancer for men. These are things we ought to be thinking about.

We have somewhere in the 90 percentile success rate if we catch breast cancer early and aggressively pursue it. They're in the early 60s, like, 61, 63 percent. This is something that we ought to be concerned about.

If you get an orthopedic problem in Canada, say, a bad knee that you need to get fixed, you could wait 5 years before you get in to see the orthopedic surgeon, where, in the United States, you could probably see him day after tomorrow, and you could probably get surgery done next Monday. So we have to think about those things.

But we've got a health reform czar, and I'm sure she's going to tell us how it's going to work.

TARP czar, now that's particular and peculiar to what we're doing right now, and that's the TARP stuff. And there may be some understanding as to where that is. But, you know, we were told by two Secretaries of the Treasury that they were going to oversee this and they were going to make sure nothing bad happened. Okay. Now that's what they told us. We heard one under George Bush, and we now hear one under Barack Obama. And both these guys have told us that they're going to be looking out for our money over here. But we've got Mr. TARP czar is doing that.

And the stimulus accountability czar. Accountable to who? And what does that mean? But I'll tell you, there's no doubt about it now. This is true. The American people are sure worried about how this money's being spent and where it's going, and is there any waste, fraud and abuse involved in it as it comes out, because when you start throwing around billions and billions and billions of dollars until you reach trillions of dollars, it doesn't take a rocket scientist back home to figure out that much money is just a target for somebody to abuse the system. So maybe that's a good thing.

Nonproliferation czar. I assume that's nuclear proliferation. That's what you always hear connected to the proliferation word. But the question is, that's sort of new.

Terrorism czar. You know, when 9/11 happened, and this was before I came to Congress, when 9/11 happened, the Members of Congress here, in their combined wisdom, in a very, very, bipartisan effort, which everybody wondered about bipartisanship, in a very bipartisan effort, created the Department of Homeland Security. And it wasn't just for borders. It was for all issues to protect the homeland of America. And they became the entity where we gathered experts on terrorism.

Of course, all of our military services intelligence divisions have always had information about terrorism, because that's part of their job. They know who has to clean up the mess after the mess is created. And so our military certainly has that information too.

But we created, I would argue, one of the largest, outside of the Defense De-

partment, Departments in the entire United States, and it was created because of terrorism, but now we've got a terrorism czar.

The drug czar we've had, I'm pretty sure, in every administration for the last four administrations. And I know how that works, and I understand how that works. Now, whether or not we—drug czars have had the absolutism that the word “czar” seems to indicate, I don't know, and whether these folks are going to have that kind of absolute authority is anybody's guess.

Guantanamo closure czar. At least we know this guy is going to be out of work by the end of next year, that is, if the administration keeps their pledge. Now we've been told, absolutely, that by this time next year, Guantanamo will be closed. And so this guy's got a short—he's on a short leash.

The AFPAC czar, I don't even know what that does.

Middle East peace czar, well, you could just also call him an ambassador, a credentialed ambassador or whatever they call those people that go out and negotiate peace. And George Mitchell's done more than his share in his lifetime, and he's very competent. I'm not going into the competence of any of these people.

As far as I know, all these czars could be, ultimately, Allan the Great, Carol the Great, Adolfo the Great, Gary the Great, Jay Scott the Great. I mean, just like Peter the Great. We don't know how great these guys are going to be; but they could be one of those. And let's hope none of them end up being Ivan the Terrible, because that would be terrible.

Persian Gulf czar. Sudan czar. Now, we have an ambassador to Sudan, I think, and we have diplomats that work with Sudan. We have a Secretary of State who has an office that Sudan falls under, and I'm sure she has got some of the best experts on Sudan anywhere in the country, just like she does on the Persian Gulf, just like she does on the Middle East. The Secretary of State has the best people we can hire, and some of these people have been working in this field forever.

And now we've got a Sudan czar. This means this is the absolute monarch of Sudan experts? And what does it mean? Or is it just an associate of the administration that needs a job? I don't know. I don't know what it does.

Climate czar. It's not climate change czar. It's not global warming czar because we've had to change those terms. We started with climate, started with global warming and it started getting colder, so that's kind of dropped, and now we're at climate change czar. This guy doesn't even get the word change. He's got to be the climate czar.

You know, we always blame the weatherman for the weather. But, hey, we've got a czar we can blame now. This guy could very quickly become, that could be Steve the Terrible. Very quickly. How would you like to be re-

sponsible for the climate of the United States? I mean, that's tough. That's a tough job.

The Car czar. Well, if this guy doesn't do his job, he's going to have a whole lot less to be czar over, because the Federal Government now runs the car business and at least two of the largest three firms in our country, so he sort of could be the government auto czar because the government's now in the automobile industry. Heaven help us.

The Economic czar, and I know we've got a half a dozen people that serve in Cabinet or sub-Cabinet positions that we refer to as economic specialists, including, we've got the Federal Reserve that gives us advice on economics, and we've got the Secretary of the Treasury that gives us advice on economics, we have a board that gives us advice on economics, and there's an economist behind every bush. Probably the only thing more in Washington that we've got than economists is lawyers. Heaven help us.

But we've got an economic czar, and he's one we've heard of, Paul Volcker. And I guess Paul's going to tell us how it works.

Now, this one is the one that got me wondering about this czarship, executive pay czar.

□ 2100

There are an awful lot of people asking: What does that mean? We know at a minimum what it means is that we're going to decide what some of the big firms that took bailout money are going to pay their top executives. It has been all over the papers and on all of the TV shows about the various, huge, gigantic amounts of money that some CEOs and CFOs and others get paid with bonuses in some of these large corporations. It's really beyond most of our ability to conceive of how much money these folks get. So this guy is going to limit that.

Then the question becomes: If he is going to be the czar—the absolute monarch—over executive pay and that executive pay is going to be from anybody who took government money, then does that mean anybody who got a tax break from the government could be kind of grandfathered into this deal? Does that mean for anybody who got a grant from the government and a big one—not the bailout money, not the TARP money or the other one, the stimulus money—that he's going to get to tell them what their pay is going to be? In fact, maybe the company that you work for has gotten some of this money. Is he going to be able to tell your company what you're going to get paid? Where does it stop?

So is this really a wage-fixing czar? Is that a better term for this than executive pay czar? I don't know.

Finally—and we haven't gotten the person's name yet—there's the cybersecurity czar. Then we've run out of space on the page. I guess the next thing we'll find out is that, instead of 22 czars, we may have 42 czars.

I tried to find out what these folks get paid, but I haven't been able to figure it out yet. Stay tuned. I'll try to come back to you and talk to you about what all of these czars are going to get paid. You know, if they're following in the Russian pattern, it's going to be pretty good because those czars lived in some pretty nice houses, and they did pretty well. So, in 300 years, the Romanovs had 18 czars. In 146 days, the Americans now have 22 czars.

I am very pleased to see that I'm not by myself today. I have a good friend. My good friend, colleague and classmate is here, STEVE KING from Iowa. STEVE is always ready to have some fun.

STEVE, what do you think about all of this? I'll yield to you as much time as you wish to consume.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, Judge CARTER, I so much appreciate your bringing this issue to the floor of the House of Representatives. I appreciate the chance to address Madam Speaker in this subject matter.

I have not seen this list of czars. Actually, I went home for the weekend, I think, with 19 czars and arrived back in Washington with 22 czars. There might have been 3 that materialized over the weekend. I look down through this list, and the first thing that hits me is, well, let's see: border czar. I'm the ranking member of the immigration subcommittee. I've never heard of him. I'll go right down the list. A few of them I've heard of but not very many, so I don't think they have a very high profile—but czar, czar, czar 22 times.

There were only 18 czars in all the history of the Romanovs. Did I get that right?

Mr. CARTER. That's correct.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It occurs to me, if you think about the flow and the continuum of history, all of the czars were precursors to the Marxist era of Russia. So I don't know if this is any kind of thing we ought to be thinking about, but the implications that come with the nomenclature here of these people who are supposed to be managing these jobs for which we already have people to do causes me to think:

Is this a precursor for what's happening in a nation that has seen our major industries nationalized? Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—nationalized. Large investment banks—nationalized. The largest insurance company—nationalized. I didn't see any czar here for de-nationalization, for one thing. I'm looking for that. I'd like to appoint that czar of de-nationalization. I could find just about anybody on the Republican side of the aisle who would make a good de-nationalization czar because, you know, I'll present this list that's in my head but that's not very well refined, and maybe we'll get it a little better.

It just occurs to me that there are, oh, 6, 7, 8, 9 or 10 different things that President Obama has engaged in without an exit strategy. That would be the

nationalization of a list of our major investment banks. I don't know how many that is—four or five perhaps. It would be the nationalization of the largest insurance company, AIG. It would be the nationalization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. So I may be up to about eight. We ought to research this list a little bit before we publish it as the final total because I could surely forget some. Now I'm to 8, 9 and 10. Let's put down Chrysler Motors and General Motors while we're at it. When you end up with a 60 percent share in General Motors that the taxpayers are holding—that's the American taxpayers—and another 12.5 percent held by the Canadian taxpayers, that would be 72.5 percent of General Motors that is owned by government. It would be 17.5 percent owned by the unions, and it would be, I think, around 12.5 percent owned by the bondholders, the part they were able to hold together of their secured interest.

Yes, we need a czar to figure out an exit strategy for all of these things that President Obama has engaged in without an exit strategy. It occurs to me that he was elected as President of the United States, in part, because of his relentless criticism of President Bush for going into Iraq without an exit strategy. Now I've just named 10 things that he has entered into without an exit strategy. By the way, for all of them, he said, I don't want the government to own them, and I don't want to have to manage them, and it's not my business to do so.

Turn around the next week and nationalize something else. Do a photo op with Hugo Chavez. That great nationalizer in Venezuela appears to me to be a piker compared to the one we have in the White House.

As for these 22 czars that we have, the ones that stand out and get my attention are, for example, the executive pay czar—the payroll czar—the guy who sits there and figures out Joe's making too much money and Shannon's making enough, and we need to have some more people out here who are sacrificing for the good of the whole. I look at that. Then as I understood this, too, it went beyond those who had taken Federal money, but they were going to at least look at executive pay in all of the large corporations—at the CEOs—and make sure that that wasn't out of proportion.

Do you remember that number? About \$500,000 is plenty enough for anybody to make in a year or so. I think, theoretically, you could put a cap on all of that. It's harder to do so if there isn't Federal money involved, but it's not impossible to do so if you look at some of the impossible things that have already been accomplished by this administration.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman would yield, I would reclaim my time for just a moment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CARTER. If the issue would be a Federal nexus, it would be hard to find

an industry, really, that wouldn't have some connection with the Federal Government if they've gotten a grant, if they've gotten a fellowship, if they've gotten a guaranteed loan, if they've gotten a tax break that's designated for their industry that other industries didn't get. All of these categories could be quickly expanded to add to that stimulus czar, if you will.

So I'll yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas for pointing that out, because there is a Federal nexus in almost all business in America, and they can find a way to control it.

My father always told me there's a difference between "reasons" and "excuses." He knew the difference. I didn't always know the difference, but today, I think I do. These are excuses. Think of this: The executive pay czar—the payroll czar—looking in at CEOs. He fires the CEO of General Motors. He hires his guy. He appoints all but two members of General Motors' board of directors. He says, I don't want to run this company, but you're going to have to build a car that looks and runs like this, and you're going to have to stop building these cars, and we're going to make this all environmentally friendly in this fashion, and we're going to decide who gets paid and how much—who gets paid, because he fired the CEO, and how much.

By the way, we had the CEO of AIG, who was working for a dollar, who came to this Congress and who, I think, was treated disrespectfully by the members on the panel. He should have—and did—thrown the thing up. He was trying to do the right thing for America for \$1 a year, and that wasn't enough to satisfy them.

So I'm thinking: What Fortune 500 company would be exempt from the scrutiny of the executive pay czar—the payroll czar? I can't think of one, because they view these corporations as being evil capitalist corporations.

They still haven't looked over into Hollywood, for example, and decided that some of the actors, directors and producers are probably making too much money by their own standards here. They wrote a lot of checks to these people who are in the White House today, so you haven't seen that scrutiny that would come; but if you're going to be an executive pay czar, you should look at everybody's executive pay.

Then I suppose we get into the professional sports athletes, who do make a lot of money. Maybe, you know, you're playing, so that must be fun. It probably doesn't demand more than \$500,000 a year no matter how good you are. Pretty soon, America is no longer a meritocracy; it's a rate-regulated government entity that decides who gets paid and how much.

The payroll czar, outrageous. It is really outrageous. The climate czar. You know, I remember we did a dedication to a park we built in my hometown of Odebolt. We did it on the last

Friday of October, which is a very risky thing to do outside in Iowa. I gave the opening speech before we cut the ribbon. Then Pastor Johnson stepped up. It was a beautiful day. It was 75 degrees on the last Friday in October. You just don't see that in Iowa. In my opening speech, I said, Well, I take credit for the weather. I planned this. After I took credit for the weather, Pastor Johnson stepped up to give the opening prayer, and he said, Now I'm going to give credit for the weather where it's due. I deserved it. He did it with the right tone, and I appreciate that exact correction.

The climate czar. I'd like to talk to the climate czar about the science involved in this. I'm not finding people who understand, who can explain and who can defend the science in this alleged global warming. By the way, this isn't even the climate change czar. He could have been the global warming czar a year and a half ago. Six months ago, he should have been the climate change czar, but now, since the climate is changing in the wrong direction, he's just the climate czar. So there is a sense of desperation that as this Earth seems to be flattening out or cooling marginally that their argument is disappearing, and they have to pass this cap-and-tax legislation before we get a longer track record of an Earth that's not warming.

I'll say this into the RECORD: These folks who are pushing—WAXMAN and MARKEY—are wrong on the science. They can't defend the science. They can't argue it against people who are of equal scientific training. They can't even argue it against me. I'm happy to do that, by the way, and I'm happy to have that debate with Al Gore and with the rest of them who come along. Even if they were right on the science—and they're not—they're really, really wrong on the economics. This has almost become a religion. It has got political inertia.

We saw and heard from a Ph.D. from Spain. Spain embraced the green country. They wanted to be the leader in green energy for the world, in the industrialized world, so they set about doing that. They built a bunch of wind chargers, and they raised the cost of their electricity. They became the leader in renewable energy of the industrialized world. They also became the leader in unemployment at 17.5 percent. They became the leader in the increase of utility bills—20 percent to residents but a 100 percent increase for industry for electrical bills. This was over a 3-year period of time.

Even then, they couldn't keep up with the additional costs of electricity, so they had to bond them out on the international financial market. They didn't have the money to pay the bills, so they pledged the full faith and credit of the Spanish Government to later on pay off these bonds, which truly means that the cost of green energy in Spain was being passed down to the grandchildren. They couldn't even pay their electrical bills in this time.

So they lead the world in unemployment at 17.5 percent. They created a lot of green-collar jobs at the cost of \$770,000 a job and at the cost of 2.2 private-sector jobs that they lost.

So I'm hopeful that the climate czar, Mr. Todd Stern, will take a look at Spain. I would refresh the memory of the Speaker and of yourself, Judge. Take a look at Spain because President Obama has said we should learn from Spain and that we should emulate Spain. They have led this green revolution. I'm convinced that the climate czar had to have taken the oath to be supportive of such an idea or he wouldn't be the climate czar.

As I listened to our Secretary of Agriculture testify before the Ag Committee last Thursday, of all the logical questions we asked from both sides of the aisle, it looked to me like he had to take the oath to support the President's agenda on this Markey cap-and-tax legislation no matter how bad it is for agriculture and no matter how bad it is for our economy.

I wonder if all of these people believe that you can grow the economy by increasing the expenses of business in America, because that's what cap-and-tax does. So put the climate czar together with the economic czar together with the executive pay czar. I wouldn't worry about cybersecurity. I'd like to penetrate that and know what all they have to say and how they're really thinking about this convoluted approach.

□ 2115

But the payroll czar is the one that gets me the most, the one who can decide what everyone ought to be paid. And I'm wondering, before I yield back, that if they're going to control the pay of the neurosurgeons and what would a neurosurgeon be worth. Would he be capped at \$500,000 a year, too? Or could we just get a cheap lobotomy for some of the people who thought this up.

Mr. CARTER. This bottom of the page, you're right. The one thing I find good about the climate czar is the poor old weatherman is going to get a break, because when the weatherman on Sunday night says it's going to be a beautiful day all day long and it rains, who do they blame? The poor old weatherman. Now they can blame the climate czar.

You know, these folks here, here on the majority side, they would like all the center of the universe to be Washington, D.C., and there you go. Now, everybody in the country will be blaming the climate czar for bad weather. At least we've got centralized blame.

I'm sure that there are some people sitting at home saying—and in this body saying, Why are you talking about this? I think there is something really critical that we need to interject into this, and I said it briefly, but it really takes us out of the realm of humor and into the realm of seriousness.

When you realize the Founding Fathers that created this country, they

assigned the government with checks and balances, and this circumvents that system. This puts absolute authority in these people's hands at this category. And they have not gone through any Senate confirmation, which the executive branch, those people are supposed—all of our Secretaries and Under Secretaries have to be confirmed by the Senate. We've got a good friend in this body that's going to be—that has been nominated for Secretary of the Army, and I certainly hope he gets confirmed by the Senate, and I'm sure he will, but he has to go through that.

These people don't go through that. There is nobody overseeing this but the executive department, but the President of the United States. So there's no congressional oversight. There's no judicial oversight, both of which were created by our Founding Fathers. No. The only real person they answer to is the President of the United States. And they work for the President of the United States. He hired them. He chose them. He put them in this position. I'm sure he's paying them good money. But they don't do what our Founding Fathers envisioned our country to be doing. So what does it create? It creates an executive department that is garnering power in every area.

I'm joined by my very good friend from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT. I yield to you however much time you wish to consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend, also former judge, for yielding. And your last comments were exactly what I would like to discuss as well, and that is these people are unelected. We were promised before the November elections that they would have unparalleled transparency, that you would know everything about the government, everything that was going on. We were going to be transparent. We were told if only we would elect the Obama administration, elect him President, and that would happen.

And we've heard people say in this body that there was a mandate, you know, that we got a mandate to do. No, he didn't. You barely got a majority that elected you to have transparency.

We were promised there would be change because this administration would stop the insane deficit spending. And some of us, including those of us here, were not happy with our own President Bush and his administration spending too much money. And they got enough of our colleagues to help them spend too much money on our side of the aisle, some from the other side of the aisle, but it was too much money. And the people voted him in to stop the insanity. So this is what we're getting.

And a czar, I would submit, is probably the proper term because they're not accountable. You know, the Senate tried to get Rattner to come over and testify. We don't know how much they're making. They have these

closed-door meetings and they're making these incredible decisions about the future of the automobile.

Now, some people don't understand, but if you study enough history, you know that when you can no longer produce the essential things you need to conduct warfare to defend yourselves when you're attacked, then you're going to stop being a country. When you can no longer stomach doing what it takes to win to protect your country from nut cases around the world, then you lose the country. And here, we've got these people who are just ignoring the law.

And you look at what this czar did with cars. Now, he said, Well, we didn't tell them which dealerships to close. But this closed-door secret society appointed by President Obama meets behind closed doors, exerts pressure. We've already seen the pressure this administration brings to bear: Well, you do this or else we're going to go out and we're going to blacken your name among the media. And we've seen that happen.

We've seen the beating that secure creditors took when they simply said, You really ought to follow the law here. Well, they were being un-American. Those people, Madam Speaker, those people were not being un-American. They were trying to follow Chapter 11 law. The law is clear. It has been for years. There's going to be a Chapter 11, there is going to be a plan. There's got to be disclosures about the plans. There's got to be hearings about the plans. There can be alternatives to the plan. You can have objections. You can have motions for relief from the State. You could have all of these kinds of hearings. Well, they just bypassed all that law, just bypassed it and said, We're going to turn the law upside down because we're secret-meeting czars who are not going to let people have their rights under the law. We're going to obliterate the law, which they did.

And then they found a bankruptcy judge who they believe would probably sign off on this plan because, let's face it, if you're a bankruptcy judge—of course, they come up for reappointment every 14 years. I don't know when this judge comes up again, but apparently he wants to be a judge for a while longer. But anyway, they found a judge who was interested in not having all the hearings the law requires to give the dealerships a fair hearing, to give the secured creditors a fair hearing, to give the unsecured creditors a fair hearing, to give all of those who had contractual relationships with those who were being addressed by this secretive czar meeting behind closed doors—there should have been hearings. There should have been transparency. That's what the voters voted for, and they didn't get any of that. Just turned the law upside down.

So I hope that my friends will be pleased to hear that since we're taking up the Commerce, Justice and Science

appropriation bill this week, I've got an amendment in there. It's very simple. It says no money appropriated can be spent to pay the auto task force, including the car czar. If they're not going to tell us what they're doing behind closed doors to turn the laws upside down and to ignore the constitutional takings, which is occurring, and to ignore all of the contract law, the bankruptcy law, if they're just going to ignore the law, then we need to ignore paying them. And I hope that the Rules Committee, I feel like we'll have a lot of bipartisan support on this because I know people on both sides of the aisle want to know what's going on. We were promised transparency, and by golly, we gotta have it.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding, especially on this topic of czars, but we know what happened to the czars. People got sick of it and they threw them out. Now, I would never advocate what happened to the last czar and his family, totally inappropriate. But here in America we have another way of throwing out czars. We have elections, and the people have a choice. They were promised transparency, and this kind of baloney is not it. And I hope the American people respond appropriately.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for his passion.

I was on the floor of this House about 6 weeks ago talking about exactly the same thing. We like to tout the rule of law. We like to say—and, in fact, it's true—that what really makes America work is having the rule of law. That means when you make a contract, we honor that contract. When we have laws on the books, we follow those. We can depend—as an investor or a purchaser or an employee, we can depend upon those laws which have been written in the bankruptcy arena, for instance. And I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague that the way this has been handled, we have thrown the rule of law in bankruptcy law right out the window.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. One further comment about that. By getting a bankruptcy judge to sign off on this, now this unelected, unaccountable, non-transparent body has gotten under the guise of one lazy bankruptcy judge's signature, they now have cover or color of the law.

Now, I thought when Justice Ginsburg stayed the sale to Fiat that we might finally get some rule of law, but it looks like so far the bankruptcy court on up to the Supreme Court has said, You know what? We're scared of these people, so let's just let these unelected czar people, let them run things. And judiciary, we're not going to hold them accountable.

And if this body, this Congress does not hold them accountable, then we have become a country run by czars be-

cause the Congress has not made them accountable, judiciary's not made them accountable. So they're just running things. And everybody has allowed them to usurp the things that the Founders fought and died and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. We cannot let that happen.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman.

I believe my friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) would like some time. I'll yield 5 minutes to Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas for yielding, and as I look at this list, a couple of things do come to mind. I'd go back and refresh two places there: the TARP czar, Herb Allison, and the stimulus accountability czar, Earl Devaney. Those two places there, add that up. We're at about, oh, let's see, \$1.5 trillion, in that neighborhood. Now very close to that.

And it might be good to ask them, Where's the money and where did it go? Now we've got a centralized place to at least ask the question on a level of accountability. Now, these people are not accountable to the Senate for confirmation. They're not accountable for elections, and they are accountable only to the President, as far as we know. But the least we could do is put some pressure on them and ask for a full accounting of where's the TARP money and are we going to let all of the people who want to pay that back pay it back. And does the money come back to the Treasury, or are you going to roll that over into some other venture capital kind of government endeavor.

And the stimulus accountability czar, Mr. Earl Devaney, I would be really interested, Madam Speaker, if we could get an answer back from the stimulus accountability czar on where is all that money. How much of it has been spent and where? How much of that went into infrastructure? How much of it actually converted into jobs? How much of that infrastructure is going to be usable and useful and stimulate the economy? I would like to see the list.

And I understand that the number of those dollars that have actually gone into infrastructure is something like 3 to 4 percent of the overall \$787 billion that were appropriated in the stimulus plan, which was the same as the TARP funding. Hurry up and put the money out now because we're in an economic tailspin. We had a Chicken Little drill going on here in this Capitol a couple times in the last year, and that yielded \$1.5 trillion from the taxpayers that my grandkids are going to have to pay. And we still don't know where the money went, and we still don't know how it is that all of this money that's appropriated didn't get implemented right away.

And now we have this long-term debt for America, this long-term debt that once you take on that kind of debt, whatever your economic crisis is that you're in, taking on a lot of debt delays it, delays the recovery. That is the

equation that takes place. And I think we should be able to have real-time accounting. There should be a Web site there. Here's your \$700 billion in TARP money, and here's where it all went. Here's a spreadsheet. Click on here and we'll give you a changing scene real-time.

□ 2130

I think there ought to be a Web site, also, for the stimulus accountability czar so that he could have that Web site up. We wouldn't have to be pressing for answers; America could just go to the Web site. They would contact us, and let us know what they think about how this money is being spent or not being spent.

But one thing we know is it has not been—and doesn't look like it's going to be—spent according to plan. And whether or not it's spent according to plan, the results don't look like what they were designed to come out of either the TARP funding or the stimulus funding that came. And by the way, I'm proud of all my colleagues for voting "no" on that plan. Remember, it was one leg of a multi-legged stool that we had to construct in order to get us out of this economic crisis; that's what the President told us that day. It looks like a multi-legged stool has got to be a four-or-more-legged stool. If it was a three-legged stool, you would say so. I've never seen a two-legged stool and I've never talked to anybody that had ever seen a two-legged stool. That would defy logic, but so does this stimulus plan defy logic. So maybe it is a two-legged stool, but I think it's more like a four or more, at the cost of about \$2 trillion a leg, Madam Speaker.

So what do we get back for that? And these margins that were to come, we weren't going to see unemployment go up over 8 percent and now it's 9.4 percent. And I didn't see how the stock market closed today, but the last I looked at it, it was down 204 points; and I don't imagine how it had a good day. The level of confidence there, it seems it's less volatile than it was, it's more stable than it was, but we have a whole lot more debt than we had. When this all started, the Chinese were happy to buy our debt. I was never happy to sell it to them, but they were happy to buy it. Today, they're not happy to buy it, and I'm not happy to sell it to them.

We've got to find a way to tighten this belt. We've got to tighten this belt down, and we've got to slow down this spending, and we've got to get back to balancing our budget. I believe that every one of us here on this floor voted for a balanced budget this year. And in the face of all this economic crisis—those of us on the Republican side of the aisle, many of us supported a balanced budget—it's hard to put one together in this tailspin that we're in. We did that. We voted for it. And that sends the right message. And every year hereafter we've got to put a balanced budget out there and build the

votes until we can actually get it balanced.

I yield back and thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for joining me.

As we sum this up here, Mr. KING mentioned something that I think is important. He mentioned we needed a denationalization czar or an exit strategy czar, or maybe both. In this world of proliferation of czars, maybe we need both. But the reality is, in seriousness, when the President of the United States came into office, he told us there is a drop-dead deadline we're going to get out of Iraq. This is it. There is a drop-dead deadline we're going to close Guantanamo Bay, and this is it. So this time next year, we won't even need the Guantanamo closure czar because it will be closed. And very clearly, we are going to draw down our soldiers in the war in Iraq.

The President has shown leadership. Whether you agree or disagree with him is for other times. But he certainly has become one who says there should be a drop-dead date, an exit strategy. I think it is important that this Congress, when we look at this massive increase in the executive department and we say to ourselves, They are not answerable to us except through the appropriations process, we can cut off the money, but other than that, they're answerable to the President.

We had nothing to say about who got hired. We had nothing to say about what the duties were. This was a creation of the executive department, and that would be the President of the United States and his staff. They owe this Nation and some of these areas a time to get out.

They say they don't want us to run the automobile industry. Well, we need to be planning on getting out of the automobile industry. We can't stay in there. The country doesn't want a government-made car. Just ask them; they don't want one. So we can get rid of the car czar, the executive pay czar, a lot of these other czars, if we would just say, this is their mission, here's when we expect that mission to be accomplished, as we did to our soldiers, and this is when we expect it to be accomplished, and by that date you either accomplish it or you're getting out.

You know, I personally think the way we look at this massive \$1.5 trillion worth of authorized spending, authorized by this House—mainly that side of the aisle—the way we look at that right now is we should be saying stimulus means rapid infusion into the economy. Anything that hasn't been rapidly infused this year we should halt. So if they haven't spent the \$787 billion—or whatever that number is—like right now, at least some papers report only \$25 billion of that money, or we'll say \$40 billion of that money has been used so far. And if you study some of those projects, many of those projects are for getting money to peo-

ple for things that will not have an effect on our economy for years—3, 5, 7 years down the road. That's not stimulus. If they haven't gotten the thing done this year, we ought to say, de-authorize it at that point in time. It hasn't worked; try something that works. That's where we ought to be. That's the way this Congress needs to start thinking because we are creating a power structure that is outside the normal power structure of the executive branch of the government. These are things for us to think about.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your courtesy tonight.

CLOSING GUANTANAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized and addressed here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I appreciate the collaboration of my colleagues from Texas, the two judges from Texas, that addressed this subject matter of the czars in the last hour.

A lot has been said about the czars, and now maybe I will just transition from that into another subject matter, Madam Speaker. But the idea that we are going to see the end of the Gitmo closing czar, it's pretty interesting to me. We have an Attorney General that seemed to have gotten that assignment. I remember the look in his eye as he was trying to figure out what to do with that January 22, 2010, mandated closing date that was established by the President in his executive order.

I have also been down to Gitmo and seen down there in the commons area where the Gitmo inmates—the detainees, the enemy combatants, the terrorists, the worst of the worst—where they get in their communal area just off of where their little soccer field is, and it's an area where they play foosball and sit in the shade just off of where their big screen TV is, where they get their refreshments and their education in the English language and the cultural education that takes place. Just off of there, Madam Speaker—and not to set the scene too distinctly—there is a bulletin board just put up, it's a ply board. And on that ply board is the executive order, the President's executive order dated January 22, 2009. It's seven pages long, the English version of it, and that's set on this ply board. And then the Arabic version is about the same number of pages. And there is Plexiglas over the top of it. So these inmates, these worst of the worst—however many we have left down there—they can interrupt their soccer game, or stop, or if they're waiting their turn to play foosball, or whatever it might be, they can go over there and read or reread the executive order which says—it's a promise to the worst of the worst, the Gitmo detainees, that they're not going to be down